

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/751,609		TRAYLOR, MARC	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Jon A Szumny		3632	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jon A Szumny. (3)_____.

(2) Eric Whitesell. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 01 October 2002 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: _____ .

Identification of prior art discussed: Nagy '158 .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner originally suggested, with approval from the Examiner's primary examiner, that the applicant incorporate that the resilient member has "the capability to return the paintbrush to its original position" into the independent claims to render all claims allowable. The applicant substantially agreed to the changes. After the Examiner reviewed the application with the SPE, the SPE stated that the incorporation would not render the claims allowable, and alternatively suggested stipulating that the "resilient member" is a "coil spring" and the "clamp" is a "screw clamp" to render the claims allowable. The applicant would not accept the changes to render the claims allowable, and hence the Examiner informed the applicant that the after-final amendment would be entered, the finality of the previous office action would be withdrawn, and a non-final rejection would be mailed.